U.S. Department of Education 2011 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

A Public School

| School Type (Public Schools): | | ~ | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| (Check all that apply, if any) | Charter | Title 1 | Magnet | Choice | | | | |
| Name of Principal: Mr. Ryan N | <u>Ioran</u> | | | | | | | |
| Official School Name: Memor | rial Elementar | ry School | | | | | | |
| School Mailing Address: | 500 Market | | | | | | | |
| | Bloomsburg, PA 17815-2134 | | | | | | | |
| County: Columbia | State School | Code Number | er: <u>1606</u> | | | | | |
| Telephone: (570) 784-7885 | E-mail: rm | oran@blooms | sd.k12.pa.us | | | | | |
| Fax: (570) 784-4341 | Web URL: | http://blooms | sburgasd.schoo | olwires.com/bloomsburgmem/site/default.asp | | | | |
| I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and o | | | | ity requirements on page 2 (Part I Il information is accurate. | | | | |
| | | |] | Date | | | | |
| (Principal's Signature) | | | | | | | | |
| Name of Superintendent*: <u>Dr. C</u> | Cosmas Curry | Ed.D. Sup | erintendent e-n | nail: ccurry@bloomsd.k12.pa.us | | | | |
| District Name: Bloomsburg Are | ea District Pl | hone: <u>(570) 7</u> | 84-5000 | | | | | |
| I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and o | | | | ity requirements on page 2 (Part I is accurate. | | | | |
| | | |] | Date | | | | |
| (Superintendent's Signature) | | | | | | | | |
| Name of School Board Presider | nt/Chairperson | n: <u>Mr. David</u> | Klingerman | | | | | |
| I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and o | | | | ity requirements on page 2 (Part I is accurate. | | | | |
| | | |] | Date | | | | |
| (School Board President's/Chai | rperson's Sig | nature) | | | | | | |

*Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

- 1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
- 3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2010-2011 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
- 4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
- 5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2005.
- 6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 or 2010.
- 7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT

| 1. Number of schools in the district: | 3 | Elementary schools |
|---------------------------------------|------|----------------------------|
| (per district designation) | 1 | Middle/Junior high schools |
| | 1 | High schools |
| | 0 | K-12 schools |
| | 5 | Total schools in district |
| 2. District per-pupil expenditure: | 7246 | |

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

- 3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Small city or town in a rural area
- 4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 4
- 5. Number of students as of October 1, 2010 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total | | | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|--|----|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 49 | 41 | 90 | | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 39 | 34 | 73 | | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 33 | 47 | 80 | | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 27 | 36 | 63 | | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 25 | 25 | 50 | | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 34 | 37 | 71 | | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total in Applying School: | | | | | | | 427 |

| 6 D : 1/ .1 : | 6.1 1 1 | 0.07 . | T 11 | A1 1 N |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------|----------|--|
| 6. Racial/ethnic com | position of the school: | | n India | an or Alaska Native |
| | - | 2 % Asian | ٨ | |
| | - | 6 % Black or | | |
| | - | 2 % Hispanic | | |
| | - | | lawaiia | an or Other Pacific Islander |
| | - | 88 % White | | |
| | - | 2 % Two or r | nore ra | aces |
| | - | 100 % Total | | |
| school. The final Gu | idance on Maintaining, ation published in the C | Collecting, and Re | eportir | acial/ethnic composition of your ng Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Register provides definitions for |
| 7. Student turnover, | or mobility rate, during | the 2009-2010 sch | nool y | ear: <u>23%</u> |
| This rate is calcula | ated using the grid belo | w. The answer to | (6) is t | the mobility rate. |
| | | | | |
| (1) | Number of students which school after October the end of the school y | er 1, 2009 until | 44 | |
| (2) | Number of students we from the school after Cuntil the end of the sch | October 1, 2009 | 55 | |
| (3) | Total of all transferred rows (1) and (2)]. | students [sum of | 99 | |
| (4) | Total number of stude as of October 1, 2009 | nts in the school | 427 | |
| (5) | Total transferred stude divided by total studer | * * | 0.23 | |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) mu | ltiplied by 100. | 23 | |
| <u></u> | | | | |
| 8. Percent limited Er | nglish proficient studen | ts in the school: | | 1% |
| | imited English proficier | | chool: | 1 |
| | iges represented, not inc | | | |
| Specify languages | - | | | |

Arabic, Spanish, French Creole, Farsi, Vietnamese, Korean, Omaha/Lakota, Nepali, Urdu, Hungarian, Bangla

| 9. | Percent o | f students | eligible | for free | /reduced- | priced | meals: |
|----|-----------|------------|----------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|
| | | | | | | | |

67%

Total number of students who qualify:

287

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services:

15%

Total number of students served:

64

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

| 1 Autism | Orthopedic Impairment |
|-------------------------|---|
| 0 Deafness | 3 Other Health Impaired |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness | 23 Specific Learning Disability |
| 2 Emotional Disturbance | 31 Speech or Language Impairment |
| 0 Hearing Impairment | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 4 Mental Retardation | 0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 0 Multiple Disabilities | 0 Developmentally Delayed |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

| | <u>Full-Time</u> | <u>Part-Time</u> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Administrator(s) | 1 | 0 |
| Classroom teachers | 21 | 0 |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | 17 | 5 |
| Paraprofessionals | 19 | 2 |
| Support staff | 8 | 4 |
| Total number | 66 | 11 |
| | | |

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1:

20:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only high schools need to supply graduation rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any student or teacher attendance rates under 95% and teacher turnover rates over 12% and fluctuations in graduation rates.

| | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| Daily teacher attendance | 94% | 94% | 89% | 93% | 94% |
| Teacher turnover rate | 3% | 10% | 6% | 13% | 3% |
| High school graduation rate | % | % | % | % | % |

If these data are not available, explain and provide reasonable estimates.

Daily Teacher Attendance:

2009-2010 - 2 teachers maternity leave; 1 teacher extended medical leave

2008-2009 - 1 teacher extended emergency leave; 1 teacher extended medical leave

2007-2008 - 5 teachers maternity leave; 1 teacher extended emergency leave

2006-2007 - 2 teachers extended leave

2005-2006 - 2 teachers extended leave

Teacher Turnover Rate

2006-2007 - 4 retirements

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools): Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2010 are doing as of Fall 2010.

| Graduating class size: | |
|--|---------------|
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | % |
| Enrolled in a community college | % |
| Enrolled in vocational training | % |
| Found employment | % |
| Military service | % |
| Other | % |
| Total | 0% |

Memorial Elementary School is located in Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania, the only incorporated town of the Commonwealth. The school was built in 1952 and named to honor the sons and daughters who lost their lives in our Country's Wars. We are located close to the center of town and serve as a hub for community involvement and outreach programs. The student population of 427 is comprised of students in Kindergarten through grade 5. Over sixty-five percent of our student population is considered economically disadvantaged, qualifying the school for Title I services. We are currently designated as a Title I targeted assistance school and are in the planning stages to become a school-wide program by the 2011-2012 school year.

Our school mission is to prepare students to become contributing, responsible citizens and life-long learners with the ability to adapt and to succeed in a competitive world. In order to foster intellectual, social, and emotional development, we embrace individual strengths. As you enter through the front doors, you are immediately embraced by the energetic, child-centered feel of the building. The hallways are filled with exemplary student work, vibrant colors, and the buzz of learning.

Memorial has been recognized at the state level by receiving a Keystone Achievement Award. The Keystone Achievement Award is given to public schools that achieved Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years. These awards reflect the hard work our school is doing and the success our students are achieving. Memorial is one of 1,003 schools that have received a Keystone Achievement Award every year since the program's inception in 2003. This demonstrates the continued effort of our students, staff, and families to sustain academic achievement and a commitment to excellence.

In addition to our academic achievements, Memorial has received national recognition for its ability to foster community involvement and a love for reading through the Scholastic Book Fair. Since 2006, Memorial has been recognized in the Scholastic Book Fairs' national "Big Ideas" contest. Our school is the only school to have ever won this distinction two years in a row. As the National winner, we have generated over \$57,000 in resources, materials, and books. In addition to our prize winnings, we received visits from Caldecott Medal winner, best-selling author and illustrator Brian Selznick in 2008 and author Christopher Paul Curtis in 2009, winner of a Newberry Medal and the Coretta Scott King award. Through our creative reading challenges the last four years our students have generated over 900,000 reading minutes. This event has served as a wonderful opportunity to have community leaders, educators, businesses, volunteers, and parents all working together to raise awareness of the importance of reading and to ensure that all students have a source of appropriate reading materials.

We achieve our goals by utilizing the talents and resources of our school and community. One way this is accomplished is through our partnership with parents, volunteers, and Bloomsburg University. Over the past few years, our collaborative efforts have led to the implementation of after-school clubs as well as academic intervention programs. Several of our after-school clubs/programs include foreign language, homework, academic enhancement, chess, Odyssey of the Mind, yearbook, and Big Brothers/Big Sisters. In addition, we partner with Bloomsburg University to provide students with one-on-one tuturing in the areas of reading fluency and comprehension. We further support the acquisition of reading skills by offering a comprehensive summer reading program to students in kindergarten through eighth grade. In addition, we host a free lunch program in the summer to school-aged children.

The staff's willingness to initiate and support systemic and systematic change has created a positive learning environment that enables everyone to experience success. Most recently, our school has implemented a school-wide bully prevention program, Olweus, as well as established a positive behavior support plan. These programs help to identify clear expectations, promote good character, and set high expectations, while creating a single-school culture.

The support of our parents and the Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) helps us achieve our goals. The PTO is an active group of parents who support school initiatives by funding programs, providing resources, and coordinating volunteers. To enrich and enhance our educational program, the PTO funds grade-level field trips as well as school-wide cultural arts' programs. The PTO's continued dedication to our students, staff, and families allows us to ensure that all students, regardless of backgrounds, have the necessary tools to be successful.

Our school's overall success can be attributed to the continued dedication and commitment of students, staff, parents, and the community. Together we focus on establishing positive relationships, continuous improvement, and meeting the diverse needs of "Our Children."

1. Assessment Results:

Students in grades three through five take the Pennsylvania State System of School Assessment (PSSA). The PSSA is a standards based criterion referenced assessment used to measure a student's performance in relationship to the Pennsylvania Academic Standards for Reading, Mathematics, Science, and Writing. Student results are grouped in four categories based on their test results. These categories include: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic. Advanced scores indicate superior academic performance with an in-depth understanding of skills. Proficient levels reflect satisfactory academic performance indicating a solid understanding and adequate display of skills. Basic level reflects marginal performance with a partial understanding and limited display of skills. Finally, Below Basic level reflects inadequate academic performance with little or no understanding of skills. For more information regarding PSSA data go to: https://solutions1.emetric.net/PSSA/Main2.aspx

Since 2006, PSSA data indicates significant progress in mathematics and reading for students in grades three through five. From 2006-2010, the percentage of students earning a proficient or advanced score in mathematics increased significantly for all subgroups. In 2010, 89.0 percent of all students scored proficient or advanced; an increase of 16.5 percentage points over 2006. Students receiving Special Education services made the greatest five-year gains (36.1 percentage points), followed by Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students (18.5 percentage points) and Caucasian students (16.5 percentage points). Additionally, African American students made the greatest three-year gains (26.2 percentage points). Comparative trends are noted in the disaggregated data by grade-level. Most notable are the gains made by students in 5th grade. Since the baseline year of 2006, the percentage of 5th graders achieving proficient or advanced in mathematics increased by 34.4 percentage points, 32.7 percentage points for the Socio-Economically Disadvantaged subgroup and 24.2 percentage points for the Special Education subgroup.

The percentage of students earning a proficient or advanced score in reading also increased for all subgroups from 2006 to 2010. In 2010, 78.0 percent of all students scored proficient or advanced; an increase of 11.8 percentage points over 2006. Students receiving Special Education services once again made the greatest five-year gains (31.8 percentage points), followed by African American students (24.7 percentage points) and Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students (17.8 percentage points). Comparative trends are noted in the disaggregated data by grade-level. Most notable are the gains made by students in 5th grade and 3rd grade. Since the baseline year of 2006, the percentage of 5th graders achieving proficient or advanced in reading increased by 24.2 percentage points, 30.1 percentage points for the Socio-Economically Disadvantaged subgroup and 24.2 percentage points for the Special Education subgroup. In addition, reading scores in third grade have risen from 75.8% proficient/advanced in 2006 to 90.6% proficient/advanced in 2010.

In the most recent year's data, an achievement gap of 10 or more percentage points exists between the test scores of all students and the test scores of students receiving Special Education services. Although a gap exists, our Special Education subgroup has also made the most significant gains over the past five years. The percentage of students receiving Special Education services scoring proficient or advanced in mathematics increased from 30.6 percent in 2006 to 66.7 percent in 2010. Similarly, students receiving Special Education services scoring proficient or advanced in reading increased from 16.7 percent in 2006 to 45.5 percent in 2010. Comparable results are present in grade-level data. Most notable are the gains made by students in 3rd grade and 4th grade. Since the baseline year of 2006, the percentage of 3rd graders receiving Special Education services achieving proficient or advanced in reading increased by 53.6 % and the percentage of 4th graders receiving Special Education services achieving proficient or advanced in mathematics increased by 66.9 percentage points.

Although performance scores for students receiving special education services continue to pose a challenge, new interventions and instructional techniques implemented over the past five years have resulted in significant and sustainable gains. Since 2006, performance gaps between special education scores and aggregate scores have closed from 41.9% to 22.3% in mathematics and from 49.5% to 32.5% in reading. The significant gains can be attributed to several key initiatives. Over the past five years, special education services have shifted from a predominantly isolated pull-out model to a more comprehensive and inclusive model in all academic areas. All students receive core instruction in reading/ language arts and mathematics in the general education setting. Furthermore, a co-taught 90-minute mathematics block has been implemented in grades one through five to provide intensive support in the least restrictive environment. In addition, more emphasis has been placed on differentiated instruction by utilizing flexible small groups in all core subject areas to effectively meet the individualized needs of all students. The implementation of common planning time in the areas of reading/language arts and mathematics has supported the development of a professional learning community. At these meetings, the general education teacher, Title I specialists, and special education teachers meet to plan differentiated lessons, share best practices, and review student assessment data. The re-alignment of Title I services and Special Education services across all grade levels enables targeted instruction and instructional interventions to be implemented to meet the needs of students performing below grade level.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Data-driven decision making is essential to student achievement. A variety of assessments, including formative, summative, and standardized tests, are utilized to acquire students' level of performance. For example, prior to entering kindergarten, students are administered a readiness skills assessment. Data from the assessment is analyzed to identify students' strengths and needs in the areas of Concepts, Language, and Motor. Furthermore, the analysis drives the development of heterogeneous classes and the identification of support services and specialized programs required to meet the needs of each student.

Data collection and analysis continues at the primary level and intermediate levels where students participate in benchmark assessments three times a year. Students in kindergarten through second grade are administered the DIBELS assessment to measure phonemic awareness, letter naming fluency, and oral reading fluency. Students in grades three through five are administered the 4SIGHT assessment to measure students' understanding and application of basic skills and to predict achievement on the PSSA. Data from both benchmark assessments are analyzed by classroom teachers, Title I specialists, and special education teachers to identify "at-risk" students who are in need of instructional interventions. Students who are identified as "at-risk" receive targeted interventions and are progress monitored to measure academic growth and program effectiveness. Ongoing analysis of progress monitoring data allows for timely adjustments to intervention groups and instructional practices to meet the changing needs of each student.

In addition to benchmark assessments, teachers also collect both informal and formal data through observations, work samples, unit tests, quizzes, exit slips, performance assessments, and projects. Based on the data, teachers determine students' present levels of performance and are able to make informed decisions about instructional needs. For example, in mathematics, teachers utilize the data to form small groups and provide differentiated instruction based on each groups' level of understanding.

Analysis of local and state assessment data are also utilized by the school's leadership team to identify building-level, grade-level, and team-level needs. Goals are then developed based on the identified needs in three areas: academic, environmental, and professional development.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

Student performance is communicated to parents through a variety of mediums. Formally, parents receive a report card quarterly and are invited to attend parent/teacher conferences twice a year. During the conference in the fall, teachers review the components of the report card, student work samples, and current levels of academic performance. Teachers may also model instructional practices that parents can

use to further support the acquisition of skills at home. In addition to the scheduled conferences, parents and/or teachers may request a conference any time throughout the school year to discuss a student's progress. Parents are also invited to attend our Title I Parent Advisory Committee meetings. At these meetings we provide information about state and local assessments, academic standards, and grade-level requirements.

Quarterly progress reports are provided to parents of students who receive Title I or Special Education services. The progress report is utilized as a tool to communicate students' academic growth toward quarterly and end of the year benchmarks. In addition, teachers identify specific areas of strength and needs and revise goals to match students' current levels of performance.

Student performance on state assessments are provided to parents each fall through the state created *Report to Parents*. The report is mailed to parents and provides a detailed explanation of individual student results. In addition, the annual results are communicated through the use of the school website and school newsletter. School-wide and district results are shared with parents and the community through an annual presentation made to the school board. The presentation focuses on building and district level results as well as developing trends. From these presentations, assessment results are also shared through news releases to the local paper.

4. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Memorial faculty members share exemplary instructional practices/strategies, programs, and success stories at the district, state, national, and international levels. At the district level, faculty members take leadership roles in both planning and presenting at in-service programs. Recent district-wide in-service programs have included the following topics: Strategies for Integrating Reading and Writing across the Curriculum, Standards Aligned System Portal Investigation, and Standards Based Report Card. Faculty members also play an integral role in Bloomsburg University affiliated conferences i.e., The Jones Center for Special Education Excellence Summer Institute and the Bloomsburg University Reading Conference which reach a significant number of state-wide teachers and para-educators. Teachers also support field experience, classroom observations, and internship opportunities for Bloomsburg University students. A long time partnership has existed between Bloomsburg University and Memorial. Each year student teachers from various State Universities are mentored at Memorial.

Memorial programs have served as models for other local school districts. Visitations are arranged between area educators and our staff members. The Speech and Language Development program as well as the Full Day Kindergarten program have been observed by local districts looking to initiate similar programs in their own buildings.

The district's Induction/mentoring program provides newly hired teachers in the building with an opportunity to dialogue with other new district hires, veteran mentors, and district administrators on a biweekly basis throughout the school year. Collaborative opportunities are available on a weekly basis via grade-level team meetings or departmental meetings. The Expressive Arts K-12 departments meet district-wide once a month fostering the sharing of ideas and successes among the various buildings in the district.

At the state level, teachers have shared by presenting at professional conferences and conventions including: State Associations, The PA Governor's Schools, and Pennsylvania Department of Education sponsored workshops and projects. One specific example involved the Governor's Institute Team which was invited to present the topic of Single School Culture at the Annual Safe School conference and the Governor's Institute conference in 2008. Teachers have served on state-level professional committees and have developed and written professional publications. At the national and international levels, teachers have served as presenters at conferences and conventions, served on professional committees and contributed to the development of professional publications.

1. Curriculum:

Overview

Pennsylvania's Academic Standards serve as a guide for district-wide curriculum development and instruction. Curriculum committees utilize state standards and anchors to develop curriculum maps and instructional guides for mathematics, reading/language arts, science, and social studies. Teachers utilize curriculum maps, research-based instructional resources, and supplemental materials to develop and implement differentiated instruction to meet students' individualized needs.

Reading/Language Arts

The reading curriculum, based upon state standards, guides teachers as they develop units of study and lesson plans. Reading instruction in the primary grades utilizes a four block approach that focuses on scaffolding early literacy skills using a research-based scope and sequence. Intermediate reading instruction often uses a cross-curricular approach, supplementing thematic units with developmentally appropriate trade books and texts. The Houghton Mifflin Reading Series is utilized in kindergarten through grade five and includes a grade level anthology, as well as remedial and extension readers for small group instruction. In addition, grades three through five have the opportunity to incorporate literature circles and leveled libraries to enrich the students' reading experience. Our goal is that students will become strategic readers and writers throughout their lives.

Mathematics

The central component of our instruction is based on the Everyday Mathematics program. The focus is on student learning through the use of manipulatives, hands-on explorations, and games. We utilize a 90-minute instructional block in grades one through five and a 60-minute instructional block in kindergarten that is comprised of the following components: engagement activity, whole group instruction, guided practice, independent practice, differentiated small groups, assessment, and closure. In each lesson component, students are presented with concepts and are given the opportunity to investigate possible solutions through the use of various strategies. The instruction of math concepts is taught in a spiral effect. This allows students to grasp and apply a concept when they are developmentally ready. With the use of this program, the academic needs of each student are met on a daily basis and evidence of higher level thinking is present throughout all grade levels.

Science

The focus of our science curriculum emphasizes what students know (the content) and how they come to know it (the process). Students actively construct ideas through their own inquiries, investigations, and analyses to develop an understanding of concepts. The program engages students in these processes as they explore the natural world. Our science program correlates to both the state academic standards as well as the National Science Education Standards.

Social Studies

The social studies curriculum is based on the state standards and provides students with opportunities to explore content areas related to history, geography, civics and government, and economics. To begin, classes use reading in the content area strategies to understand textbook material. Content literacy strategies such as the KWL, Anticipation/Reaction Guide, and RAFT (Role, Audience, Format, and Topic) Writing Activity are utilized to further develop students' comprehension. In addition, children read trade books and participate in plays or Reader's Theaters to learn about people in history. The curriculum is also enriched through assemblies, guest speakers, and field trips, which provide our students with life experiences that many may not otherwise experience.

Expressive Arts

Expressive Arts curriculums are all based on the Pennsylvania Academic Standards. The content delivered in each class is derived directly from the standards. Expressive Arts' teachers design their own instructional materials, including power points, to deliver content through the use of interactive white boards. All Expressive Arts' teachers adhere to the guidelines of the 5E Lesson Plan model. Expressive Arts classes are taught by highly qualified specialists who integrate reading and writing through the use of interactive white boards in all content lessons. Team members also utilize the Standards Aligned System Portal and Common Core Standards to support the planning process. We offer Art, Music, Physical Education, and Library classes as well as vocal and instrumental music. Classes meet one time a week for either 30 minutes (kindergarten) or 40 minutes (grades one through five). Assessment data is used to support instructional design, student learning, and provide parents with information relevant to their child's developmental progress within each curriculum.

Physical Education

The physical education curriculum is based on National Physical Education Standards, Pennsylvania State Academic Standards for Health, Safety and Physical Education, Understanding by Design principles, and current research on developmentally appropriate practices. The Big Ideas of Play Safe, Play Fair, Play Hard and Play Skillfully support the delivery of instructional content for safety education, conflict resolution, wellness (concepts of moderate to vigorous physical activity and physical fitness) and competent performance of fundamental motor skills. Technology, via the SmartBoard, and teacher generated power points strengthen the integration of reading and writing within the physical education class instruction. Content specific vocabulary and concepts are rehearsed, refined and assessed each instructional episode. Components of the elementary physical education program have been recognized by professional organizations and highlighted in state and national publications.

Foreign Language

The Bloomsburg Area School District, in partnership with Bloomsburg University, offers a Foreign Language after-school club to students in grades two through five. The program is a twelve-week course that meets once a week after school for 45 minutes per session. The club is instructed by Bloomsburg University interns majoring in Foreign Language Education. The club provides students an opportunity to explore language and culture through various modalities and activities in a fun filled environment. Instruction is aligned to state standards and anchors.

2. Reading/English:

Motivating students to become lifelong readers and writers who are prepared to participate as responsible citizens has been a decades-long mission at Memorial. Our balanced literacy approach provides daily reading, writing, speaking, and listening opportunities. The reading curriculum, based upon PDE standards, guides teachers as they develop units of study and lesson plans. Reading instruction in the primary grades utilizes a four block approach that focuses on scaffolding early literacy skills using a research-based scope and sequence. Intermediate reading instruction often uses a cross-curricular approach, supplementing thematic units with developmentally appropriate trade books and texts. Our goal is that students will become strategic readers and writers throughout their lives.

A standards aligned reading series, Houghton Mifflin, is one component of our Language Arts program. Another component is based upon our exemplary library and extensive classroom libraries. Teachers use thousands of authentic and award-winning books to support flexible guided reading groups, teacher read alouds, author studies, self-selected independent reading, thematic units, and book take-home programs. These libraries have been achieved through the support of administrators, involved parents, a generous community, and of course educators who are excited about great books.

Memorial was one of the first schools in the area to incorporate a daily Reading/Writing Workshop time into the schedule in order to supplement a core foundations block. This additional thirty to forty minutes, which is built into the master schedule at each grade level, allows staff to work together to ensure student

success. During this time we provide reading/writing mini-lessons derived from students' needs, demonstrate research-based strategies to improve reading and writing, conference with students, differentiate book clubs through flexible grouping according to changing student needs, and immerse students in authentic literature. Three reading specialists, three highly qualified paraprofessionals, and special education teachers co-teach with classroom teachers during this time, supporting students performing below grade-level in any area of language arts. Kid writing is also incorporated during workshop at the primary level and the expansion and refinement of the writing process takes place at the intermediate level. The adoption of Gould's Four Square Writing organizer and Culham's 6-Trait Writing K-5 has resulted in the systematic implementation of a common language for the teaching of writing across the grade levels.

Strategic and intensive supports as well as interventions for students are determined by benchmark and diagnostic assessments such as DIBELS, Basic Reading Inventories, running records, curriculum-based assessments, rubrics, and anecdotal records. Individual student progress at intermediate level is also monitored using 4 Sight Testing. Language Arts instruction is adapted as assessments indicate needs. In addition, technology (e.g., all classrooms kindergarten through grade 5 have interactive white-boards and laptops) is consistently used to support student learning. Memorial is a school that strives to keep abreast of best practices in assessment, interventions, and strategies that will ensure our students' success.

3. Mathematics:

Memorial believes that mathematical instruction should transcend the classroom and prepare students to become problem solvers in the real world. The central component of our instruction is based on the Everyday Mathematics program. The focus is on student learning through the use of manipulatives, hands-on explorations, and games. In the learning environment, students are presented with concepts and are then given the opportunity to investigate possible solutions through the use of multiple strategies. The instruction of math concepts is taught in a spiral effect. This allows students to grasp and apply a concept at a time, developmentally appropriate for their individual learning needs. With the use of this program, the academic needs of each student are met on a daily basis and evidence of higher level thinking is present throughout all grade levels.

Teachers strive to provide ample opportunities for incorporating real-life, meaningful math activities during instruction. Many classrooms utilize a co-teaching format, which provides a smaller teacher-to-student ratio and also allows students to experience a variety of teaching styles. The majority of the instructional block is spent in small group activities, which allow for more differentiation of instruction to accommodate student needs. These small group centers provide us with time to further utilize technology, such as games and interactive websites on laptop computers and interactive white-boards. The Everyday Mathematics program also provides us with many math games and manipulatives that allow us to review our topics while catching students' interest at small group time. These hands-on activities have resulted in a dramatic increase in students' understanding of number sense and problem solving over the past few years.

At Memorial, we recognize that students come to us with a wide range of learning styles and abilities. Students who need additional support are identified in a variety of ways, including teacher observations and formative and summative assessments. Since we utilize a combination of inclusion and small group pull out, teachers have the ability to provide individualized instruction for students who have more specific learning needs. We strive to differentiate instruction in order to encourage a safe and successful environment for all learning styles. A variety of instructional strategies are used within the framework of the Everyday Mathematics program including peer coaching, hands-on exploration through games and manipulatives, and technology. The co-teaching model allows us to individually re-teach concepts and to better reach all learning modalities. Our para-educators are utilized for additional small group and individualized support. Many activities are also available to enrich learning opportunities for students who are working above grade level.

In conclusion, our core program of Everyday Mathematics, a strong instructional support system and dedicated, highly qualified teachers and para-educators all contribute to creating classrooms that encourage students to become independent and successful life-long learners.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

The science curriculum is an inquiry-based program, using the scientific method, which is driven by the Pennsylvania Academic Standards. It largely reflects the school's mission to prepare students to become contributing, responsible citizens and life-long learners with the ability to adapt and to succeed in a competitive world. Students achieve this goal through hands on investigations, a school-wide recycling program, integration of technology, and working as collaborative teams.

Our teachers connect content to students' personal experiences. This promotes an interest for student learning, both in the present and in the future, as students become life-long learners. Hands-on investigations are utilized as opportunities to relate to personal experiences. It generates an amazing amount of student participation and interest, which encourages students to go home and discover more about the topic.

In addition, the integration of technology into the science curriculum allows students the opportunity to use resources that can be found on the internet. For example, teachers use National Geographic Online to reinforce learning and they utilize valuable web sites as resources for science research and to study current events based on the curriculum. Since many of these resources are found on the internet, a homeschool connection is developed to further support acquisition of skills.

Students are encouraged to become responsible citizens by taking the initiative to help protect our environment. Students in grades kindergarten through grade five recycle paper through the classroom recycling program. This program was developed and implemented by students in fourth grade. Not only do the students recycle paper, but they also learn the importance of conservation.

As you can see, we take pride in enhancing the science curriculum to achieve the school's mission. The student managed recycling program, hands on investigations, utilization of technology, and working in collaborative teams all contribute to creating responsible citizens and life-long learners.

5. Instructional Methods:

Memorial is committed to its students, their families, and the community. We have many wonderful people who work in our school. This kind, caring, and dedicated staff make sure all of our students experience success. Varying instructional methods is one of the key components in making sure that all students experience success. The staff works diligently to meet the academic and emotional needs of each student who attends our school. The diverse population and high number of transient students make it necessary for us to adapt our instructional methods.

One of the instructional strategies implemented is team teaching. Special education teachers and Title I Reading and Mathematics specialists co-teach Language Arts and Mathematics with the general education teacher. Students are provided with individualized instruction and support, while teachers have the opportunity to collaborate with one another. This collaboration provides staff members with the opportunity to observe a variety of teaching methods and generate new ideas on how to best meet the needs of our students.

Along with team teaching, each grade level team participates in the team planning process. The grade-level team is comprised of the general educators, Title I Reading and Math specialists, and special education teachers. Teachers utilize the team planning process to share effective instructional strategies, resources, manipulatives, books, materials, and lesson plans. In addition, teams analyze formative and summative assessment data to identify instructional needs and develop flexible small groups. This team approach supports the development of a professional learning community.

Teachers integrate the latest research-based learning strategies into their lessons. The students engage in whole group reading lessons and take part in ability-based instruction. We utilize the research based Everyday Mathematics program as a resource for instruction. Technology is integrated into lessons and students use laptops and interactive white-boards to support and extend the acquisition of skills. The students are also given the opportunity to use higher-level thinking skills in order to challenge, extend, and maintain their interests in learning.

In conclusion, the staff works diligently to ensure that every student at our school is working to his/her highest potential and learning to the best of his/her ability.

6. Professional Development:

Professional development at Memorial is considered an investment in our students who represent the future. We must model excellence as educators if we expect superior student achievement. Our staff (administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals) strives to be up-to date on research-based best practices and standards. This personal and professional commitment to lifelong learning is evident. Teachers view an educator's job as analogous to that of a medical doctor: In order to be top notch one must continue to read scholarly journals, participate in in-services, stay involved in professional organizations, keep current with research/trends in education, technology and society, attend conferences, and communicate ideas with colleagues. Personal learning networks are essential to our continued success.

Memorial exemplifies a willingness to try new ideas, methods, and strategies. Professional development is a joint effort of administrators and teachers. Administrators provide in-services related to PDE requirements and changes. Teachers are encouraged to indicate perceived strengths and needs through the Act 48 Professional Development Committee meetings and surveys, and administration then respond to those needs. For example, when teachers indicated a need for methods to improve writing, in-services were provided in Four Square writing and 6+1 Trait writing in order to provide a common language for K-5 writing. Additionally, when a request for technology training was indicated by staff, district-level and building—level workshops were made available.

Several years ago our district implemented the Everyday Mathematics program and teachers were provided with extensive training. Ongoing professional development was provided by district and the mathematics department at Bucknell University. In addition, teachers were provided the opportunity to attend national conferences to solidify their understanding of this concept in the teaching of mathematics. Intensive teacher involvement has contributed to the success of this program. The reading program and approach was also incorporated in a similar way. Administrators additionally provide district-wide staff development to teachers and paraprofessionals through our local Intermediate Unit in order to keep us aware of current best practices and instructional approaches as outlined by Marzano. Currently, we are working to create consistency in our curriculum throughout the district by implementing an online curriculum planner. Once again this is in response to changes at the state level (common core standards have been adopted) and our desire to remain current.

A future endeavor next year will be "teacher rounds," which is an opportunity for teachers to observe, discuss, and learn from each other. As stated earlier, professional development is a joint effort. Teachers often initiate training based upon information received at conferences, reading, and professional affiliations. Faculty members, who have expertise in an area, often serve as facilitators during training (e.g., SAS and technology training). A team approach throughout the district and at Memorial certainly improves our teaching, thereby ensuring student success.

7. School Leadership:

Bloomsburg Memorial Elementary School is successful because of its collaborative approach to the education of its students. The administration, faculty, staff, and parents are all considered essential in

providing leadership opportunities to help each student reach his or her potential. The students are "Our Children" and we value each and every one of them.

Our principal, Mr. Ryan Moran, is involved in all aspects of the educational process and demonstrates the high standards that are expected of anyone actively involved in educating all students. The development of our School Leadership Team exemplifies his philosophy of shared leadership. This team, which includes a representative from each grade level and building team, meets monthly to plan, coordinate, and implement new procedures and programs that focus on the school environment, student learning, and professional development. The Leadership Team has successfully enabled us to create a positive academic and social environment for all students.

In addition to the Leadership Team, teachers have also taken on the leadership role to create a positive academic and social environment for all. Two groups of teachers attended the Pennsylvania Governor's Institute for Educators on Single School Culture in 2008 and 2009. New procedures and an outline of student expectations have been implemented with success. Their involvement in this endeavor has had a positive impact on our school climate.

The feeling of "community" is evident from the minute you step through the door. Mr. Ryan Moran is directly involved with parents by having an "open door" communication policy as well as being an executive member of the school's Parent/Teacher Organization (PTO). He has supported the development of after school activities, clubs, and programs, and is key in the partnership between Bloomsburg University and Memorial Elementary. He also writes and distributes a weekly newsletter to the families of our students to keep them updated about what is occurring at Memorial Elementary. This parental involvement establishes the home-school connection that positively impacts students.

It is not uncommon to see the principal and other administrators throughout the building on a regular basis interacting with students, faculty, and staff. Mr. Ryan Moran as well as the superintendent, Dr. Cosmas Curry, made frequent visits in the classrooms and other building areas, talking with students and staff. During classroom visits, they are actively engaged with students and the learning process, while fostering a personal connection with many students.

At Memorial we value the role of each and every individual that helps provide the opportunity for all of our students to be successful!

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment Edition/Publication Year: No Edition/2009- Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation, Maple Grove,

2010 Minnesota

| | Minneso | la | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
| Testing Month | Apr | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 89 | 89 | 92 | 78 | 88 |
| Advanced | 64 | 56 | 65 | 45 | 67 |
| Number of students tested | 53 | 66 | 62 | 78 | 66 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 88 | 84 | 85 | 66 | 84 |
| Advanced | 53 | 41 | 56 | 32 | 51 |
| Number of students tested | 32 | 37 | 27 | 41 | 37 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 71 | 67 | 70 | 56 | 58 |
| Advanced | 50 | 8 | 40 | 19 | 17 |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 12 | 10 | 16 | 12 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: | | | | | |

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment Edition/Publication Year: No Edition/2009- Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation, Maple Grove, Minnesota

| | Minneso | ta | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
| Testing Month | Apr | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 91 | 82 | 94 | 69 | 76 |
| Advanced | 57 | 41 | 23 | 30 | 47 |
| Number of students tested | 53 | 66 | 62 | 78 | 66 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 84 | 76 | 96 | 54 | 62 |
| Advanced | 44 | 24 | 7 | 12 | 22 |
| Number of students tested | 32 | 37 | 27 | 41 | 37 |
| 2. African American Students | | | <u>-</u> | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 79 | 50 | 80 | 38 | 25 |
| Advanced | 14 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 12 | 10 | 16 | 12 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: | | | | | |

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment Edition/Publication Year: No Edition/2009- Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation, Maple Grove, Minnesota

| | Minneson | ta | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
| Testing Month | Apr | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | 96 | 97 | 80 | 87 | 84 |
| Advanced | 64 | 78 | 56 | 57 | 48 |
| Number of students tested | 66 | 64 | 78 | 63 | 77 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | 92 | 94 | 67 | 79 | 76 |
| Advanced | 49 | 69 | 33 | 38 | 32 |
| Number of students tested | 37 | 32 | 42 | 34 | 37 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | 90 | 82 | 38 | 40 | 23 |
| Advanced | 0 | 36 | 13 | 0 | 15 |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 11 | 16 | 10 | 13 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: | | | | | |

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment Edition/Publication Year: No Edition/2009- Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation, Maple Grove, Minnesota

| | Minneson | ta | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
| Testing Month | Apr | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 76 | 83 | 69 | 81 | 79 |
| Advanced | 55 | 50 | 37 | 40 | 42 |
| Number of students tested | 66 | 64 | 78 | 63 | 77 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 68 | 78 | 52 | 68 | 68 |
| Advanced | 49 | 38 | 21 | 18 | 32 |
| Number of students tested | 37 | 32 | 42 | 34 | 37 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 20 | 36 | 19 | 30 | 15 |
| Advanced | 0 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 8 |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 11 | 16 | 10 | 13 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: | | | | | |

Grade: 5 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment Subject: Mathematics Edition/Publication Year: No Edition/2009- Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation, Maple Grove, 2010

Minnesota

| | Minnesot | ta | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
| Testing Month | Apr | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | 83 | 75 | 71 | 76 | 48 |
| Advanced | 64 | 44 | 47 | 44 | 15 |
| Number of students tested | 63 | 77 | 70 | 79 | 79 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | 73 | 54 | 60 | 63 | 40 |
| Advanced | 55 | 30 | 37 | 29 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 33 | 37 | 35 | 38 | 40 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | 27 | 30 | 29 | 9 |
| Advanced | | 13 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | | 15 | 10 | 14 | 11 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: | | | | | |

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment Edition/Publication Year: No Edition/2009- Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation, Maple Grove,

2010 Minnesota

| | Minneso | la | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
| Testing Month | Apr | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 70 | 57 | 59 | 46 | 46 |
| Advanced | 27 | 9 | 21 | 11 | 8 |
| Number of students tested | 63 | 77 | 70 | 79 | 79 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 58 | 35 | 49 | 26 | 28 |
| Advanced | 18 | 5 | 14 | 3 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 33 | 37 | 35 | 38 | 40 |
| 2. African American Students | | | <u>-</u> | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | 7 | 0 | 7 | 9 |
| Advanced | | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | | 15 | 10 | 14 | 11 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: | | | | | |

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 0

| | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | 89 | 87 | 81 | 80 | 73 |
| Advanced | 64 | 59 | 56 | 48 | 42 |
| Number of students tested | 182 | 207 | 210 | 220 | 222 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | 84 | 76 | 69 | 69 | 66 |
| Advanced | 52 | 45 | 40 | 33 | 29 |
| Number of students tested | 102 | 106 | 104 | 113 | 114 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | 91 | 73 | 65 | 67 | 86 |
| Advanced | 64 | 40 | 29 | 33 | 50 |
| Number of students tested | 11 | 15 | 17 | 15 | 14 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | 67 | 55 | 44 | 43 | 31 |
| Advanced | 27 | 18 | 17 | 13 | 11 |
| Number of students tested | 33 | 38 | 36 | 40 | 36 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: | | - | | | |

Subject: Reading Grade: 0

| | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | <u>-</u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| Proficient/Advanced | 78 | 73 | 73 | 64 | 66 |
| Advanced | 46 | 32 | 28 | 26 | 31 |
| Number of students tested | 182 | 207 | 210 | 220 | 222 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 70 | 62 | 63 | 49 | 52 |
| Advanced | 37 | 22 | 15 | 11 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 102 | 106 | 104 | 113 | 114 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 82 | 60 | 59 | 53 | 57 |
| Advanced | 18 | 20 | 12 | 27 | 7 |
| Number of students tested | 11 | 15 | 17 | 15 | 14 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 49 | 29 | 31 | 25 | 17 |
| Advanced | 9 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of students tested | 33 | 38 | 36 | 40 | 36 |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: | | | | | |